

NEW HAVEN ADVOCATE (CT)
29 September 1982

Lost Liberties

"It's important that the public know our committee is not afraid to go public with criticism, even though that criticism may not be pleasant for the intelligence community." These bold words were spoken by the House Intelligence Committee's Charlie Rose, Democrat from North Carolina. Rose and fellow subcommittee members had worked hard on a report showing the CIA and other intelligence agencies had tailored information on Central America to fit the rhetoric and ideology of the administration. "There has been sloppiness, inaccuracies and overstatements," he said, that could logically lead to administration policy manipulating the intelligence operations, "rather than policy being guided by properly evaluated intelligence."

The subcommittee on Oversight and

*Edited and compiled by Jim Motavalli
and David Reid.*

Evaluation found many instances where intelligence agencies had determined that investigating violence by rightists was not considered "a suitable task for intelligence."

Voting to release the report went along party lines in the Democratic-dominated committee. CIA and other intelligence agencies lobbied hard to keep the report confidential, and were successful in having controversial parts edited out, although *The Washington Post* received and reported on both versions of the document.

In a related matter, a federal appeals court ruled last week that former *New York Times* editor Harrison Salisbury was not entitled to National Security Agency documents containing his name. The court ruled that Salisbury was entitled to neither the documents nor compensation (for violations of his Constitutional rights to privacy). The court also said that covert domestic spying on U.S. civilians and political groups by intelligence agencies could not be prohibited. Twenty-one defendants sued the government because government agents involved in "Operation Chaos"—conducted during the late 1960s to investigate the influence of foreign governments on anti-Vietnam War groups—had spied on them illegally. In both instances, said the court, national security necessitated violations of the defendants' rights.